

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 7, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols, David Wobker, Mery Velastegui

STAFF PRESENT: Judd Black, Development Review Manager; Steven Fischer, Senior Planner; Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner; Dianna Broadie, Senior Planner; Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner. Gary Lee, Senior Planner, was absent.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide. Our procedure is as follows:

- A. Staff will give a presentation of the project to the Board.
- B. The applicant then has an opportunity to comment on the project. The speaker should give their name for the record and sign the sign-up sheet.
- C. After the applicant, others in the audience may comment, either in favor or in opposition to the proposal.
- D. After all comments are heard, the Board will discuss the project openly and may request comments or have questions of the Applicant.
- E. The Board members then vote to approve, approve with conditions or deny the project.
- F. If the applicant does not agree with the Design Review Board's decisions, they have the right to appeal and should contact the technical staff member.

RECORDING

The meetings are tape-recorded and the recording will be part of the official record of each case. It is important to identify yourself prior to speaking so that you may be included in the recording.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board, Sally Promer-Nichols, at 7:00 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Lee Madrid made a motion to approve the May 3, 2007 minutes. Seconded by Robert Hall. Passes 2-0 with 3 abstentions.

APPROVAL

L060503, RiverPark Mixed Use

Description: 316 Housing Units; 145 Rm HOTEL; 108,593 SF office; 18,800 SF retail

Location: 159th Pl. & 78th

Applicant: Scott MacKay

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 556-2418 (Judd Black filling in)

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, pointed out Gary Lee was not present tonight, so Judd said he would be speaking for Staff. Judd pointed out at the last Design Review Board meeting, the applicant came with some changes in the elevations and the materials. There were a few members here for that meeting who gave feedback to the applicant. The applicant has met with staff several different times on this, and is looking forward to a discussion with the Board about the difference of the materials, what it means to the quality of the design, and what difference it makes to the approval the applicant has for the project. The applicant is seeking approval of the changes in materials and elevations tonight. Judd says the staff would like to focus on the elevations that are next to the park, because the project will be the most visible toward that elevation as people come into Redmond off of Redmond Way, and off of 85th Way across the river. This project will probably be the first thing people see when they come into Redmond, and it will be a feature piece of architecture when people come into town.

The other issue the staff is asking the applicant to consider is the interior streets for buildings B and E, particularly B, to see how those materials matter to the public that will be there. The interior of B and A will be materials that are different than what was approved by the Design Review Board. The architect is here to talk about what those differences are, and it will be up to the board to determine if those materials are adequate. The staff is concerned about the livability of the project. Design and materials are important to the staff, but frankly, less important than the interior of A and B, considering the tenants look across to the each other, not the public. It will be important to staff to concentrate on the elevations of A and B as they front the river, as well as building B, along Lagoon Lane.

Kerry Nicholson, speaking for the applicant, spoke to the cost issue brought up at the last meeting. After talking with contractors about the residential portion of the project, the applicants learned that the residential portion was about \$9 million, on the hard cost side, which is 20% of the budget. Applicant says he's just now getting back "in round" on budget. The two biggest contributors to that are going from a steel structure back to a wood structure on the internal part of the building, which was a multi-million dollar reduction in costs. Plus, working closely with city staff, the applicant gained some new net rentable area. Much of that space was not additional kitchens, or other expensive components. That helped with the budget too, offering the investor a better yield. The applicant also made some value engineering efforts, including the interiors. Lastly, the applicant combed through the building looking for places to do a better job on the cost side, yet still making a commitment to quality. That would include some of the window areas and the exterior cladding. That cladding product is a Panasonic product, used overseas a lot, but new to this area. It's well tested, with some great characteristics.

Nicholson commented on the "fragility" of the project, in that the applicant is joined at the hip with his office, the Group Health people, and the hotel people. Earlier, there was a concern those tenants would drop out on them, but now those tenants are asking the applicants how they're doing. Nicholson offered assurance that the applicant's financial partner, Black Rock, wants to be involved in a high-quality project as well as one that's financially viable. Legacy Partners have been working to improve things when it comes to cost, but they promise not to skimp on quality, and they're dedicated to making this project one the city can be proud of, that Legacy can be proud of, and that the financial partners can be proud of. Nicholson invited the Board to be part of an effort to find workable solutions that the Board's happy with and that are financially sound.

Scott MacKay spoke on behalf of the applicant about the site and the presentation materials. Old elevations and new elevations are noted on the pictures presented to the Board. Material changes are also designated for buildings A, B, and E, so the board can see what's being swapped for what. There are three major areas of change on the buildings. One is a slight expansion of the building envelope, done by expanding the cantilevers that are already there a little bit further. There is a change in the window systems, which could be an issue for the staff on the west side of the building. The cladding system has changed too.

The proposed north elevations show the applicant tried hard to keep the look and the feel of the building comparable to what had been discussed before. Some of the switches on Building E include the bump-out boxes. The boxes are still there, but the materials have been switched. The townhomes on the base of building E remain as originally set. The retail section and the vertical element have slightly changed, in part due to the fact that the elevator system switched, and the pop-out above the roof doesn't happen any longer. The cladding has been switched to a different pattern. The stairwell behind the retail center is gone; it will come up in another elevation. The applicant went from a corrugated metal backdrop to the ceramic tile backdrop.

The proposed elevations on A and B have changed. Some of the board expressed confusion over page numbers. The cladding system has changed from Perdema to the Sierra Clad system. That's because the Perdema is four times more costly, and it does not come with an exterior warranty for its application. Sierra Clad is a laminate system. The boxes are pretty much the same location. There's full brick cladding from the ground up, and there's a change from corrugated metal to a lower grade material. There's a switch in the patterning due to sheer wall capacity. The window system has changed, but that's the one area the Perdema material will be used, on what the applicant called the Mondrian wall, which faces the central court. If the system fails in there, it could be replaced out, because it's simply metal pads.

A window system has been switched out in the façade, due to cost overruns and also because it's switched from a condo project to an apartment project. The storefront design has changed as well. The stairwell has been changed, but there's still a stair climb that goes into the courtyard system, and there's a connector into the other courtyard system. The little stair has been replaced. The lobby is still in the same location. Waterproofing experts were criticizing the applicant for some design concerns, so the deck has been stacked to unify it. This is on the inside of the building, in the inner courtyards. The colored switching still exists. The garage stayed the same, with an indentation to allow for emergency access.

On the "butt" end of the building, there are some changes. A fire code resolution is behind many of the changes. Specifically, city staff said this building was too close for the amount of glass the project had on that corner. The units still face outwards and have their windows, but across the space, the amount of glass had to be reduced. The stairwell's been enclosed as well.

On the backside, the applicant showed the previous design and the proposed one. There's a change to the glass and the Mondrian wall. A proposed idea from the architect on that wall could be interesting, combining some different materials, blending them together. It's a design motif, but if the Board doesn't like it, the applicant could switch to a similar pattern, like what's on the other side. The applicant didn't want to block the garage, which would inhibit access to retailers. It will be open and have cable railings. The garage has a basement level, a mid-level, and half an upper level. The mid-level will have two entrances, and provide most of the parking for the project. The middle level is not a secure garage, though there is a management company that will watch it. The basement and upper level are secure parking. Staff suggested painting some black on the façade facing the alleyway.

The "butt" end of building E has some changes, too. The middle level is no longer secure; it's open. There's space for vines to grow on the outside of it. There's a chain link fence close to road level. The applicant wanted to open the project to nice views, so decks have been put in and stacked, keeping the rhythm established on the inside. On the other side of that building, there's very little change. The grill has been switched out, but the garage is still the entrance. The end of the townhome switched to another pattern.

The portion facing the park has some changes, in part due to the fact that the window wall system was extremely expensive. This is the major change the applicant is proposing. The applicant tried to keep the overall look and feel the same. The first big change involves a switch on the first level. There's an indentation and a deck rather than a system up against the building. The steps will change too. A horizontal sunscreen will be added at the first level to match the second. The architect wanted to call out the syncopation in this space. There's a level of non-glass as well. At the base, there are townhomes with their own individual expression, though the window pattern has changed slightly. Those homes still have their own metal awnings, which is fairly rare for projects in the city. There are still bi-fold, movable sunscreens that collapse against the wall when they're not needed. There are also some double sliding glass doors. The gas fireplaces are in the top penthouse unit, and some windows have been added. The chain link is also being proposed in another area as well. There's a walkway that's changed slightly, so the view from the park is different, too. That's effectively below grade in front of the townhomes. The window system switched over the in the retail area as well. The architect can answer specific questions. A trellis will be removed.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS AND STAFF:

Judd Black pointed out that the changes to materials as well as design need to be understood. He asked, why are these materials better?

Ray Johnston from Johnston Architects answered. DRB is swapping metal with recycled, durable ceramic in some different areas. The color of the Perdema will be matched in the ceramic product, which has a texture the applicant likes. The architect will attempt to match the texture and ribbing of the metal in the ceramic product, which has a 20-year warranty and good recycle-ability and high recycled material content. The metal is an inferior product technically, and when you consider the distance from which this material will be seen, the effect would be the same.

Judd asked where the metal would be switched out on Buildings A and B in the north elevation. Architect says the only place you'd get close to this material would be near the townhouses in a few spots and that ceramic is a more durable product that's not cheap, but more affordable with a longer lifespan and better warranty.

The board asked about how big the panels were. The architect said they were 18' x 10' panels, a ceramic and fiber core material. The company that makes them is working to create the color combinations the applicant is looking for. What the applicant didn't like about it was that this material continued to turn a beige color. Now, the company is working to create some stronger colors. The material can be installed vertically or horizontally. Hardy panel is not popular, and this ceramic panel is a big step up from that, according to the applicant. There's some good texture quality in the ceramic, and now questions about the color have been answered. On the Mondrian wall, this product would mix with the orange peel stucco product, which would not be all that much different from the gray used before. The brick will be retained along Lagoon Lane. The patterning of the decks, there is some value engineering, so most of the original expression has been retained.

The awnings and railings are still metal above the retail space. The low-end system is aluminum, but the one the architect chose is not and has more character to it. It could give a little more of a sense of privacy without blocking views. The material on the top floor is now the Sierra Clad, but it could be switched to metal on the north façade. Matching the two materials could be a challenge, but it could be done. There would be a change from the Perdema box to the ceramic box. The front, or north side of E, would be a metal product. That hasn't changed from what was approved before. The pattern requires custom, flat-seamed panels.

The west elevation, or park elevation, will need some clarification. There's an alternate the city asked the applicant to look into, which would include a glassier look. 1' windows could go on either side, or there could be a combination of two-pane and three-pane windows. There could be more glass options in this idea for a façade, but the applicant likes the box-out look that he proposed. It's up to the board to come to a conclusion on this window issue. There are two different window options, both of which provide different looks. Windows could go up another floor, but the applicant says it would look weird. Something growing on the screens would provide a different look. The architect says he likes the emphasis on the second and third floor the screens provide. The screens are made of wood, with a darker finish that should go well with the brick.

The board asked about the removal of the security screens for the middle level. The applicant explains that level is not secure. It doesn't have roll-down gates or any security arms. It just has two openings to drive into, similar to Redmond Town Center. It's a 700-stall garage that's just open. The vertical element is part of the garage wall. Vertical stripes will go into the garage; they're wires that vegetation can grow on. Lighting will be screened, so there will not be glare. Along the property line will be a tree line that's about five to six stories tall, of evergreens. There's a fence line as well as a drive, a gully, another tree line, a set of garages, a drive, and then the building. So that's a distance away and well screened. Attorneys and parking management say presenting a garage as secure may give people the wrong impression. The car headlights would be below the internal railing system, so about 42 inches or so. It's a heavy cable there. There's about three and a half inches between the cables. Essentially, the applicants are removing the screen and replacing it with cable.

The board asked about the AB north elevation. The opening to the garage got larger due to pedestrian access, fire access, and two-way traffic access. Primarily, it's wider because it went from a one-way to a two-way. Transportation wanted more of the public circulation out in front of the building. It will be finished as you walk inside, and there will be room for a pedestrian path. The board asked about the stairs, and if they'd look like a dark tunnel. The applicant says the stairs still spill out. The space still tapers, but the stairs are straight. It's still a glassy, glowing box on the lobby side, and the architect is still happy with that in terms of volume and it's dramatic nature. All of the landscaping and the decorative plaza are still out in front of it, along with the glassy box to provide a nice, glowing feature. Why not a Chihuly, asked the Board, with a few laughs. The applicant says it will be some sort of modern art piece.

The board asked about the elevations. The top has a yellowish tint; the bottom has a browner tint. The architect explained in the graphic drawing, there's a small discrepancy, but the applicant would make sure it would match. Some on the board like the subtle touch of the lighter color. The architect says he's sensitive to the balance the board is talking about, and wants it to be lively, not dull. The architect is still making sure the colors are right.

The board asked about the east elevation of building E. The applicant says these changes should help the buildings, though they're different, "talk" to each other. The materials at the top of that building will cross over exactly to the other buildings. What was approved was another material on building E. The board asked why the windows had to be changed. The applicant explained that below 18", it would switch to a totally different window type, with more expensive security glass. This was part of the cost consideration. The applicant is trying to maximize the glass inside the units. Architect says changing the windows back to a more average size helps with costs.

The board asked about the elevator penthouse and how the elevation has changed. The architect explained that because there's a mezzanine in that unit, a 13' floor is required. Vertical cladding will be included. The applicant pointed out a syncopated window rhythm between the buildings to tie them together.

The trellis is gone in the new plan, and board asked if there were some new trees included. The applicant pointed out they were not new trees. Above that area is still a gathering point with a fire pit where the residents can look out over the park. The board asked about Building E, on the east elevation. The top once had aluminum all over it, as well as CMU. The north elevation on the building is a good example. CMU will be used in some parts, for an industrial look, but some of the corrugated metal will be changed to Sierra Clad. The east elevation has a change in materials too, with additional Sierra Clad added. All of the townhomes are three floors, and all will have the Sierra Clad material. The board made the comment that such a look would appear very cheap. Windows have been added to change the look, but the applicant can be flexible on some of the Sierra Clad material, possibly having a smooth stucco finish.

The board raised the point that it might be a good idea to approve elevation levels, then discuss other matters to avoid confusion. One point raised was that there may be too many vertical lines, creating a "too busy" look in one part of the project. The rhythm of the materials appeal to some members of the board. Another board member says he doesn't have a problem with the elevation, but prefers alternative two. He also likes the double sunshade that has been added. Robert Hall says this appears to be a normal process of trying to adapt to cost overruns, and he's supportive of the changes. He approves alternative two. He doesn't see the point of the screens on the third floor, but would possibly agree with accordion screens. The applicant says he was looking for horizontal sun reduction.

David Scott Meade is less sympathetic to all the changes, especially to some of the big changes. He's ambivalent about the screens on the third floor. He thinks the building in the middle will look cheap, especially around the doors. Formerly, there were some lines around the door showing some richness. He points to areas to the left and right of the stairway as well as part of his critique. The applicant says there were some vertical boards that could be put back. But the horizontal look should still be there that David is asking about; it's apparently missing in the detail of the new drawings. David says he's very sensitive to changes because he's a resident and will see this all the time, and wants this building to look darn good. He's afraid of giving up some of the views coming into the city. Other board members say either alternative works. Some like the screens up higher. The little notch between the two buildings will be really important. The applicant says the plan could move back to the original expression of the vertical wood and continuous horizontal line, but thought that would look too commercial. The board raised the idea of keeping the awning going, continuously across, which the applicant didn't think was a problem.

The board, after reviewing notes, determined the AB west elevation looks good, with the exception of the centerpiece, which the board would like to keep as what was approved by the DRB originally. There's a split on the board on what should happen on the upper floors. The board likes the 5 panel windows all the way up, but wants the middle section that was already approved. That elevation is complete.

The board also likes going up two stories with the screen, and no more. The board discussed the centerpiece, which has a good-looking cap, but not a good-looking base. Upper floors will have overhangs and will be recessed, similar to alternative two.

The AB north elevation will have a change in materials in two different spots, and on the end of the building also. There will be more wood than glass in the new plan as a cost-saving measure. Large windows rather than glass walls will be used. The changes in elevations are acceptable. The glass at the bottom is not what it was, but it should be fine. The Mondrian panel appears too regular now without as much glass. The applicant suggested adding more vertical parts to it. There will be Perdema on part of this elevation. The reason for the window change is to improve windows for the townhomes, according to the applicant, and the Mondrian walls will match up with a red tone. The north side will have Perdema. On the south side and inner courtyard side, the applicant will use other materials, but match colors.

The board raised a question about the top elevation, and if metal would be used. The applicant says the design can be flexible, but Sierra Clad is acceptable to the board to keep things looking the same. A balcony has been taken away, as part of the "push-out" effort to add square footage. The fenestration system on the storefronts has changed quite a bit. The applicant says it's an effort to make it a more special place. The idea is to save money by having similar panels, using a quantity of panels rather than mixing it up. But there could be flexibility, according to the applicant. Creating a simpler storefront will make it easier to lease. The applicant talked about putting a panel in the base to add expression.

The AB east elevation drew some comments from the board. The architecture pointed out that the stair up above was simplified to help with budgetary concerns. But the gray will come down a bit to add to the look of the building. The board recommended changing the vertical stripe to look like one of the other exterior colors, perhaps an accent color like dark red or dark gray. The board pointed out this part looks much like Avalon Park Square. There was a concern to make some of the color a little less yellow.

The AB south elevation involves some changes that will mean not using Perdema board. The changes will turn the vertical sections red to look like the north elevation. The board would like an improved vertical expression, using some reddish tone and perhaps some different materials and striped patterns. The board's concerned about the proximity of the parking garage to the apartments. A light study was performed, and the tree line, along with the different drives, creates quite a bit of distance, according to the applicant. Residential parking, the applicant points out, is on the upper floor of the mezzanine and the basement, so there shouldn't be too many problems with headlights going into the apartments. The applicant has an easement with the adjacent property owner. The board would like to add some more green to the "living wall" the applicant is considering, but not an invasive plant like ivy. Possibly clematis or honeysuckle will climb up the cable system in several different locations.

The E north interior drew some comments from the board. The board was concerned about two overhang floors that are not included in this new set of drawings. The applicant says the steel needed to do that cost too much, tens of thousands of dollars. There will be a column at the entry with a sign about the project. There's metal at the entrance to the building with a standing seam. The door system has changed for the apartments because, beforehand, you'd have to enter the kitchen when you would walk in. There's also an ADA concern regarding those doors. Material above the windows in the apartment units is Sierra Clad. The horizontal piece is a gray color, and is a metal panel. The board suggested changing the color of the steel to a red family of colors. The applicant says the idea is not to make things too busy, but they will take it under advisement.

The E West elevation added one mezzanine level in the inner courtyard, and you won't see the garage from that level. It's a little taller, according to the applicant, to match the front. The mezzanine units will have bedroom lofts, with windows up above. The board approved the changes. The E South elevation involved the addition of decks. The board says this elevation has been improved, and didn't want to make any other changes.

With the E East elevation, the applicant moved the deck to the tree side instead of the garage side. The end units have had their balconies moved to around the other side to improve views. The chain link around the garage is below grade, and not able to be seen. David Scott Meade has some concerns about the materials used in the middle of the elevation, specifically with the color between the townhomes. Some on the board say the addition of windows has improved the look of this elevation. In the front, that middle piece is the elevator shaft. Following the pattern on the north elevation, Meade points out, the material should be smooth CMU. The architect says the darker gray material could potentially overlap, creating a rectangle with the windows composed inside it. That could pick up some of the syncopation from the front. Or, the applicant could bring some of the wood used in front around to this elevation to improve the look.

The board discussed the materials, and said the black chain link should be used, not the galvanized material. There was a question raised about the ground face CMU. The applicant said it was a natural color. There's a tint to the seal on the CMU that will affect its color, and should turn out well. Mr. Meade is concerned about the elevations that will have direct sunlight on them, and the effect of that on color. Applicant explains the project will have a lighter color in the sun.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LEE MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L060503, RIVERPARK MIXED USE, A MOTION CONCERNING THE NEW ELEVATIONS AS WELL AS MATERIAL BOARD PRESENTED BY THE APPLICANT. THE MOTION CARRIES THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF:

- **AB WEST ELEVATION SHOULD HAVE ALTERNATIVE #2, WITH THE FIVE-PANEL GLASS. THE CENTER SECTION WILL BE AS PER THE PREVIOUS APPROVED ELEVATION. TWO LEVELS OF SCREENS ARE APPROPRIATE ON THE RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS.**
- **AB NORTH ELEVATION, THE MONDRIAN WALL PANELS SHALL BE, RE-RANDOMIZED. THE SIERRA CLAD IS OKAY IN THAT LOCATION. ALSO, LOOK AT ANOTHER HORIZONTAL GLASS PANEL SHALL BE CONSIDERED.**
- **AB EAST ELEVATION, THE CENTER STAIR AREA HAS NOW BEEN ENCLOSED. THE GRAY CLADDING WILL CONTINUE FROM TOP TO BOTTOM VERTICALLY, AND THE COLOR SHOULD BE CHANGED TO A DARK GRAY ACCENT COLOR.**
- **AB SOUTH ELEVATION, THE MONDRIAN WALL SHOULD LOOK LIKE THE NORTH ELEVATION, NOT THE PROPOSED ELEVATION. THE VERTICAL SIDING, WHICH IS CALLED THE "CAST STRIPE" SIERRA CLAD, SHOULD BE MORE OF THE REDDISH TONE, AND MORE RANDOMIZED STEEL CABLES FOR PLANT GROWTHS AT THE BOTTOM.**
- **E NORTH ELEVATION, THE SIERRA CLAD VERTICAL CAST STRIPE, CURRENTLY A CHARCOAL GRAY, SHOULD BE CONSIDERED MORE IN THE RED COLOR DISCUSSED.**
- **THE E WEST ELEVATION WILL HAVE NO CHANGES.**
- **THE E SOUTH ELEVATION WILL HAVE NO CHANGES.**
- **THE E EAST ELEVATION, IN THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THAT, THE APPLICANT WILL CONTINUE THE SIERRA CLAD VERTICAL CAST STRIPE, WHICH IS CALLED A CHARCOAL GRAY IN THE RECTANGULAR FORM.**
- **INVESTIGATE REFLECTIVITY OF THE YELLOW COLOR, WHICH IS CALLED CAMEL, ON THE COLOR BOARDS.**
- **THE CHAIN LINK FENCE SHOULD BE BLACK IN COLOR.**

MOTION APPROVED (5-1).

APPROVAL

L070178, Microsoft MA Building 92

Description: Renovate existing buildings into mix of corporate learning center and offices, to include minimal site work. Project is within the limits of the Microsoft West Campus site.

Location: 105th Ave. and NE 36th St.

Applicant: Shawn Mahoney / Olympic Associates

Staff Contact: Kerry Kriner / 556-2464

David Wobker excused from the meeting. Kerry told the Board this is the third time board members have seen the project. There were two previous pre-applications, one on March 1st and one on April 19th. This proposal consists of renovating what's now the Eddie Bauer headquarters. It is being deemed now as Building 92 by Microsoft. There will be new entry canopies put on the main entrance and the northeast entrance. There will be two new emergency stairs, based on change of use requirements by the Building Code. There will be a new loading dock area to coincide with the service area on Building 95. A new clinic will be present. There will be new landscaping and pathway system to coordinate with the west campus landscaping and pathways that surround the site. Staff is recommending that the Design Review Board approve this project with the following conditions: that the sidewalks should be differentiated from the vehicular paths by texturing color and the use of a different material. This is especially necessary where the pedestrian paths cross vehicular paths, and the pedestrian pathway design shall be consistent with the materials of the west campus project. The second condition is the landscaping and lighting shall be coordinated during the Building 92 civil plan review, with the surrounding West Campus site landscaping and lighting. The third condition is the standard presentation materials and consistencies condition. The Board was very favorable of this project at the last pre-application meeting, and the applicant can answer them.

Gina Park and Scott Hunter, from NBBJ Architects, were present. Hall asked where the clinic was. The applicant stated it's on the ground floor. The clinic will provide general medical care like vaccinations and pharmacy pick-ups. It will not cover acute care or emergency medical services. The Board indicated it appears consistent with the building.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DAVID MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L070178, MICROSOFT MA BUILDING 92, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Sidewalks should be differentiated from the vehicular paths by texturing, color, or use of a different material. This is especially necessary where pedestrian paths cross vehicular paths. Pedestrian pathway design shall be consistent with the materials and thematic elements of the West Campus project. [RCDG 20D.40.45-040 (2)(f)]
2. Landscaping and lighting shall be coordinate during the Building 92 Civil Plan Review with the surrounding West Campus site landscaping and lighting. [RCDG 20D.40.20-030(2)]
3. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.

MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

APPROVAL

L070193, Westgate Building

Description: Exterior modification in downtown Sammamish Trail district

Applicant: Steve Elkins/Mitra Mohandessi

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt / 556-2471

Nathalie Schmidt explained that this project has been before the board once before as a pre-application. The modifications to the project are on the right façade facing Redmond way, and they include replacement of tile on the mansard roof over the single-story section of the building with seam metal, replacement of some fascia, and also some wood doors with aluminum storefront doors. There will also be an addition of three arches with columns along the façade to brighten up the project a bit. There will also be some painting of the walls. The board will look at the colors; in the past, the board was pleased with the design. As a side note, some street improvements are required for pedestrians. On Redmond Way, some landscaping and a sidewalk are required, but many of those details can be worked out administratively.

The architect, Mitra Mohandessi, explained the original color scheme had blue as the accent color. The applicant was coming back with an alternate color scheme on the advisement of the board. Everything is the same except for that accent color. The color would go on the columns and on one side of the building. A reddish color would replace the blue. The architect is asking on behalf of the owners if the board would approve going with either color.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

The board asked what concerns existed about the color. The owner's preference is the blue, according to the architect, but if the board's preference is red, the owners would not mind going with that, either. The board asked about the brick exterior on one part of the building. The architect says the brick color would stay as a yellow. The board asked about the windows. The architect says the windows will be painted to match the existing colors. Four doors on the building are made of wood, and they'll be replaced with anodized aluminum.

One member pointed out that the canopies are not in character with the existing building. The question of color is not as much as putting archways in as it is considering the contemporary nature of the structure. He would prefer something more in character with the old part of the building, which is brick. Meade would like to see a more modern, contemporary look.

Mery Velastegui suggests the applicant was trying to create a commercial look, and the applicant states that the archways accent the brick panel walls. The main purpose of this work is to do some repair and maintenance, because the existing fascia, which is almost three feet, is really damaged and rotten. The roof leaks, and the building needs some maintenance and repair work. The applicants thought it would be good to take advantage of the opportunity and add to the face of the building. It's not meant to be a big renovation. One member asks why the entries are out of character with the rest of the building, but because he wasn't at the last meeting, doesn't want to undo what's already been done.

Board suggests that some members are not huge fans of the blue. Also says that those archways should be over access points to the building, rather than having them in random areas. Ms. Velastegui is suggesting a wider window trim to create a more modern appearance. The applicant is not sure if the columns can be placed further apart, because that might affect the height of those columns matching up with the height of the roof. Board suggests that the arch might be out of place, and suggests possibly a rectilinear design to stay consistent with the universal building, then add another column to beef up a "parapet" look, and leave the arches out entirely. That would keep with the existing building. The board points out that such arches might not be needed to tie into the building at all, seeing as how they're just appliqués onto the building.

The applicant points out that the existing awning comes all the way out, so the arches are within the existing awning and don't stick out into the sidewalk. The columns come out another eight inches from the existing awning, which measures about six to seven feet. The board says the vertical fascia board

could be broken up with some rectangular, boxy elements that could still sit on columns, but not in a strip-mall retail development way. The board says there's an opportunity to tie this project back to the original building, a white stucco office building. The form of the cutouts could be more modern and boxy-looking, and wouldn't need an arch. There's a parapet with a flat roof behind it, beyond the tile roof section. The board says between the two colors, the blue is superior to the brown. The building is one that you really don't notice when you pass it, according to the board. The board asked if there was a connection to the park trail from the parking lot. The applicant says yes, in the landscaped area between the street and parking lot, there is a walk that takes one to the trail. Some board members say the arches don't add anything, but the blue color is fine for the main building.

Ms. Velastegui likes the dark window trim and also likes the doors as a dark brown. She likes the red better than the blue. The applicant says that color may make sense on the columns, but on the bigger building, the applicant thinks that may be too bright. The board would like to see the project come back, especially in light of the bigger project across the street. The board sees both projects as a part of a gateway to the city, and that this project is not "there" yet. The board would like to make changes to colors and elevations. There's a vertical wall that seems to come up along the Redmond Way side that appears to be painted two different colors. The board would like to see all four elevations of the building in rendered form that would be clearer than the present materials. The board doesn't think the building needs to be a two-tone building, and says the building has some integrity as it stands. The applicant is looking for a little more attention paid to the building from the street. Part of the project is maintenance; another part is to increase visibility. The board is asking the architect to go back to the owner to re-think a few ideas with this building to keep it with its character. The board is asking for more detail and materials that are easier to understand.

ACTION: CONSENSUS VOTE TO ASK PROJECT TO COME BACK WITH MORE DEFINITION ON COLORS AND LOCATION AND TREATMENT OF FACADES, AND LOCATION OF ARCHES. CONSENSUS VOTE PASSES (5-0). ARCHITECT WILL WORK WITH THE PLANNER ON THE ITEMS LISTED: WHERE COLOR IS APPLIED, ALL ELEVATION, ARCHES, HEIGHT/BUDGET ISSUES.

Applicant asks what next actions are needed. Board responds that members want to see how the colors will wrap around the building. The current sketches are not complete, and some of the sketches cause some confusion. The board does not mind the metal roofing instead of the tile, but some members believe the arches are out of character and would like to see a more rectangular look there. Board members say until a complete picture of what's proposed is presented, members can't approve it. The blue color is not an issue for the board, just the application of it; meaning, where it's applied. The board wants to make sure the owner is being a good steward of the building, and that these improvements will take this building to a more modern look, or something consistent. The rectilinear look rather than the arch would be preferable. The board asked if there was a height issue. The applicant says no, but there is a budget issue. The tile would be replaced with metal.

APPROVAL

L060401, Penny Lane Townhomes

Description: Five attached, three-story townhomes

Location: 7950 170th Ave. NE

Applicant: Roger Newell/Doug Jingling

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt / 556-2471

Robert Hall is excused from the meeting.

Nathalie Schmidt gives an overview of the project, which had its original review more than a year ago. This is another project in the downtown/East Hill district. There have been some changes from the original. There are five units. There are a few requirements the applicant exceeds, so the applicant has requested administrative design flexibility on the units. The applicant has followed landscaping requirements, plus the pedestrian system improvements along 170th Avenue, as well as Penny Lane and the alley behind. The applicant is requesting variation on a side-yard setback, which in the downtown area is determined by lot frontage, width, and height of the building. It's supposed to be 6' on each side, but the project shows between 5' and 5.5'. Also there are encroachments in the side yards, which are patio slabs at grade and also chimneys.

Also, the city's open space requirements include private open space per unit, which is 80 square feet on the ground, which this project doesn't have. But the applicant does exceed the balcony requirements. Plus, there is the common open space area, which is 500 square feet, on the side. Also, related to that, is that the private open space encroaches into the common open space. The private open spaces are adequately screened with landscaping, up to 3' or 4' depending where it is. Administratively, the staff has approved all of these things, and would recommend the board to do the same thing. The staff is asking the board to consider those variances, as well as materials and colors.

Roger Newell and Richard Jensen spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant says the project in front of the board is very similar to what was first presented to the design review board last year. The applicant was asked to make a few revisions on the two units facing 70th Avenue. The applicant was asked to create more of a street presence for those units, and create a driveway and front door. The biggest difference will be on the west elevation, which the applicant followed by request of the board. A residential, urban character is what the applicant is trying to achieve in the building.

The window frames are a tan color, with matching, powder-coated aluminum rails. The applicant is using a combination of siding and shingles, stained in a semi-solid color. The panel is made of Paper Stone, installed away from the base of the building. There will be a gap between them. The Paper Stone has finished edges that give it some LEED points that have a good look. The building is stucco to give it a little separation and reduce the apparent height of the building. The townhomes have a tall, narrow appearance, and the light-colored stucco material should help with that. From a cost standpoint, there's not a big concern over a huge cost to put scaffolding in, so the applicant believes this project would be an appropriate location for it. There's a wood banding that will also be installed and stained. The roof will be composition, with a gray tone. There will be recessed lighting under the soffits for outdoor lighting, plus other outdoor lights that have a rusted color to tie in with the color to the building. The applicant is asking for deviations because the applicant is being required to dedicate 7' of the property on the south and 5' of the property on the east, 15% of the lot. Prior to dedication, meeting the requirement would not be a problem. There are articulated windows, with an offset peak on the larger windows to break up monotony of design. Some windows have been joined together with paneling all around located where there are two-story high places, to give it a better feeling.

The board asked about the C and D material, the Paper Stone. There are two ways to apply it. One uses a metal system that has no attachments visible. The other system would be to screw it onto a grid of 1" x 2", 1" x 4" or 2" x 4" pieces and attach it to the building in that way. This material would go around the building and onto the chimneys, too. On the plans, that appears to be hardy panel. The applicant says hardy panel was the original plan, but this material looks better. The Paper Stone is locally manufactured, and provides six LEED points. Starbucks has used it on a few buildings, and it's also used for countertop material. It's like a thick plastic laminate. The board asked if the applicant has worked with larger pieces of this material. The applicant is going to meet with the supplier to get some recommendations. The applicant says the material is about a quarter inch thick. One building on Bainbridge has this type of material, as does a building in Belfair. The material does have some pattern to it, and it's better than hardy board.

The board asked the question about private space encroaching on public space. The applicant explained he chose to provide larger deck areas rather than additional private space. One patio does open up onto the common space. It would be easy to get rid of the patio, but the applicant thinks it's a good use of the space. It's a requirement, and hopefully it will get used more privately than on a common basis. Applicant asked if there was a concern about color.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Lee Madrid is in approval of the proposal. He says it's an attractive building, and the use of the materials is acceptable. Mery Velastegui says she's also in favor, and says the building has been improved with the changes made, and she supports the colors and design. The board also asked about the panel between the windows, floor to floor, which looks like it might be the Paper Stone. The applicant explains it will be painted hardy board, to create a painted, smooth-looking panel. Hardy board or MDO would be options. The applicant has had problems with the MDO, but with the size of the

windows, less than 8' in width, that the applicant could do either material. If it works with Paper Stone, that might be considered too, according to the applicant. The board asked for a closer look at the rendered elevations. There are cedar shingles on the building in different colors, including new red cedar and bark, which the board sees as great choices. David Scott Meade says the project has come back even more attractive than before, and the applicant has listened to the board's suggestions. It keeps with the neighborhood, and he's ready to approve it.

Sally Promer-Nichols likes the project, but has one little point she wants to make. On the first floor, she's seeing a lot of blank walls. The walls tend to be garages, but she would still like to see windows in the garages. The idea would be to keep the pedestrian scale. On the southern elevation, there are a couple of bathrooms with windows, and she'd like to see more of that. She'd like to see the design get pulled down and become more pedestrian-friendly, using windows. Her last pet peeve would be to have nice light fixtures, not globe-like, Home Depot-style lights as they appear in the southern elevations. Sally said her concerns weren't big, and she'd defer to the rest of the group.

Lee Madrid has a follow-up question, asking about the blank walls being mitigated by the landscaping plan. Sally responded that there was some landscaping in front, but the few patios that come out of the bedrooms are the only pedestrian-friendly pieces. The blank walls on the first floor bother her, and she says usually in these types of buildings, the end units have more going on. She says all the activity goes up to the second floor. Seeing as how this is a residential neighborhood, she'd like to see more activity down lower. The board added that if the garage had a small, high window, it would really suit the entry door. Sally added that she had another pet peeve about not having light in the garage. The board noted the garage did have some upper transom windows. Sally pointed out the north elevation has the same situation. She pointed out this issue on the north and south elevations. The landscape, she says, could help mitigate the situation. Opaque glass for a garage window would be a good choice. The board points out the landscaping could help conceal that the door is a garage. The board admits Sally has a valid point, but it's not always fair to ask landscaping to make up for something that could be solved with an architectural fix. High windows in the bathroom and garage that matched the window look above could help the issue. In the code, there are blank wall provisions. Mery Velastegui says windows in the bathrooms would be a good idea, especially in the corner units. Sally says she supports the program, and says the common, open space for a 5-unit building is silly, and she supports the way the applicant has articulated the open space.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LEE MADRID TO APPROVE L060401, PENNY LANE TOWNHOMES, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THE BOARD DOES NOT HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THE DEVIATIONS THE APPLICANT IS PROPOSING, SO GIVING THE APPLICANT ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FLEXIBILITY IS OKAY.**
- **LIGHTING PLANS ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL, AND OF COURSE THE PRESENTATION MATERIAL INCONSISTENCIES.**
- **THE APPLICANT SHOULD INVESTIGATE WITH STAFF THE MITIGATION OF BLANK WALLS, ESPECIALLY ON THE GARAGES, AND IS HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO PLACE WINDOWS, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, IN THE BATHROOMS.**
- **THE APPLICANT SHOULD ALSO INVESTIGATE BLANK WALL MITIGATION AT THE GARAGE AREAS.**

MOTION SECONDED BY MR. DAVID SCOTT MEADE. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY LEE MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING. MERY VELASTEGUI SECONDS THE MOTION. MOTION APPROVED (4-0) TO CLOSE MEETING AT 10:18 P.M.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060075, Center Pointe

Description: Demolish two existing structures, create two new structures including a two story office building replicating the original Redmond Train Station. 3300-3400F Type V-A and a mixed used 11,500 SF retail and parking at grade level Type I-A, residential 111,560 SF, 130 DU Type III-a, five stories and two sub-grade parking levels for 180+ cars.

Location: 16325 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Redmond Gateway LLC

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 556-2418 (absent). Dianna Broadie, present.

Mery Velastegui was excused from the meeting.

Steve Fischer made the staff presentation, noting this project has been before the board before, most recently on May 3rd. That was a pre-application meeting, and architects walked through their drawings and sought feedback. At that time, the board provided comments to the architect. The board generally liked what they had seen at that time, and expressed comments. Those comments have been included in the packet mailed out to the board, and that's what the staff report is based on.

What Gary saw in the packet that was mailed out was that the plans had changed in eight different ways. One included modifying the project bays above the sidewalk. The horizontal brick band at the top of the retail level has been deepened to 4'. Transom windows above storefronts are broken into smaller panes. Windows have been changed from asymmetrical to symmetrical. The stairway from the podium garden to the public way in the south is now shown, and enclosed in the iron trellis screen. The applicant has included some historical photos for reference in the packet materials. Small roofs are shown at the top floor decks on the south elevation. A brighter, more Victorian color scheme is under consideration, and brick has been extended to the second floor above the Cleveland Street entrance.

This project is located in the Old Town District, and Dianna Broadie has been part of the review of that, and she is at the meeting as well. Based on the material submitted, Gary and Dianna had seven items that they wanted some suggestions and comments on. They first asked the board to note in the colored elevations in the packet, the painted board and batten siding is being used, and points to the recessed areas and the base of the projecting bays. Gary and Dianna are assuming the arrows for the board and batten are erroneously pointing to the face of the bays. Hardy plank lap siding is also pointing to the face of the bays. That's a drafting issue that needs to be clarified.

Item two from Gary and Dianna says the applicant should consider using shingles as an additional cladding material, perhaps over the upper stories. Number three, something needs to be added above the windows on the top floor to detail the blank areas. Item four, the octagonal bay at the northwest corner should be made cylindrical to mimic the historic silos. Number five, the applicant should consider using a roll-up, open-metal grill garage door instead of solid doors. Number six, before the cornice, the applicant should consider using architectural sheet metal. Item seven, for the next pre-application rendering, the representative area should show all the cladding materials to show how they fit together.

The applicant has continued to draw, even as suggestions from the board have come in. The board has a new packet. Steve explains there are some issues from staff. What was originally submitted was close to where the board wanted to go. The applicant heard the comments in the first meeting and responded to those comments. The staff felt the applicant did a great job in responding to those concerns, and the project was close to where it ought to be. Now, it's a little more contemporary in terms of its color scheme and some other elements. The staff turned over the presentation to the design team, with the idea of hearing from Dianna later.

Peter Watson spoke, principal for OTAK, the architects for the project. Mark Mullet was at the meeting last time, and is present tonight. Allen Bowman, managing partner for the development company Gatebay that's proposing the building. Watson says this is a key site for the entrance to the Old Town District. The project has two components, the small office building, and then the larger, mixed-use residential building. The office building is fronting both on Leary Way and the railroad right-of-way. It offers access through the site along the south side of the building. Contextually, it's an important building in relationship to what was there, and in relation to the building across the railroad right-of-way. One thing the applicant appreciated hearing the last time from the board was the need to develop some historic documentation for what was on the site before. The applicant provided a sketch and photographs of the old depot building. It was a very modest structure, but it offered some insights into how the applicant would detail the small train depot building.

Older people in Redmond might remember the old feed building on the site. Some of the shapes appear very exciting. The office building is a contemporary expression of the historic depot. It's meant to look like a building that came from the past. It has the overhangs and the roof dormers. It has the shapes

that find their roots in the older train station. The changes are hard to see, but they have been made in response to the board's concerns. The applicant has removed the masonry wainscoting proposed around the building, and would like to just use something similar to the board and batten siding seen in the applicant's presentation. The window details have been changed to replicate the traditional "two over four"-type sash.

The larger residential building has a first floor devoted to retail throughout the site. There's a portion of the garage that's a high bay, so that in the future, as the right-of-way becomes more of a pedestrian, non-motorized circulation corridor, there will be more opportunities to take the parking out and fill it in with retail spaces. There's a retail parking entrance off of 164th and also Gilman. There are two residential garage entrances, off a quiet street that's not a through street, one that's appropriate for residential access. The building is oriented around a nicely detailed, well-landscaped courtyard; the building's in a C-shape around that courtyard.

The applicant is trying to bring the level of detail and articulation on the facades more or less to the same level, so they're all equally treated. The applicant has tried to employ some strategies to minimize the overall mass of the building. Those strategies include the projecting bays and the different use of materials and the detailing of those materials, as well as color and some of the treatments of the corners of the building. The primary corner of the building is at Cleveland and Gilman. The applicant has looked at trying to incorporate the imagery of the silos that were at the T & D Feed Store, years ago. The detailing on some of the bays in the lower area are a little different than what's been done in the past, to add more interest to the building.

Working our way around the building, the façade along 164th shows some of the detailing below the windows and also on the building lapping around the corner. The applicant is trying to tie better into the south elevation along the railroad right-of-way. There's a piece of road that's a little misleading; it's actually a greenbelt. On the south elevation, facades look out on the courtyard. The treatment of the south elevation is not quite in keeping with the bays on the other sides, but the applicant says they still add meaning to that elevation.

The applicant has tried to pick up and incorporate the comments heard from the board a month ago. The applicant says he's tried to work with the tripartite organization of the building, and reinforce that. Plus, the applicant is trying to differentiate the bays over the sidewalk. Rather than having a continuous lid over the sidewalk, the enclosed bays drop down 2' feet from the elevation of the exposed decks. The applicant has strengthened a portion of the building by deepening the elevation of it. He's also added transom lights over the storefront windows, and illuminated the asymmetrical windows to highlight the more traditional detailing above the windows. The applicant has eliminated the trellises, thinking that the incorporation of hard roofs over the decks help terminate the building at the top, and add more richness to the in and out of the building with the cornice and other elements. The applicant has tried to have some more fun with the corners. The octagonal shape in some corners has given way to a rounder look, a modern interpretation of silo, if you will. It's galvanized material, terminated with a sculptured form that may be softened up. Elements of galvanization are knitted throughout the elevations, with galvanized railings proposed throughout the residential areas, and pieces of galvanized materials in the fixed canopies over the building entrance and the corners. The applicant is proposing to use a galvanized steel frame.

Some of the new intentions to detail can be seen in the brick base, with transoms and steel frames around the entrance canopy, and elements of galvanization as well to knit the building together. Finally, the applicant says the awnings, open on the sides, have a simple, galvanized steel frame. The applicant is still thinking about the same materials, the brick base and the lap siding, plus vinyl windows and a color scheme that's more monochromatic than what was sent to the board prior to the meeting.

Dianna Broadie responded on behalf of the staff. The staff had a really different proposal beforehand that just needed a few tweaks. Broadie says what's submitted now is substantially different and much more modern. She says there's a much different flavor. When Dianna and Gary went over the original plans, they thought the applicant was really close. Now, it feels like the applicant has departed from the scheme. She's feeling uncomfortable with the departure because she thinks it's substantially different. Dianna preferred the old color scheme in connection with the verticality of the elements. The new color

scheme has a lot of up and down, which is not in tune with the Old Redmond concept. One thing she approves is that the applicant has responded well to making changes in the window treatments. She also likes the changes in the silo treatment. There's now a top to the silo, albeit a modern one. Dianna says the design separates the metal into different areas rather than having one piece of continuous corrugated metal, which she likes.

Another issue at a past meeting was the detail elements. Dianna says a column with no capital looks very modern, and the board had asked the applicant to add some capital elements to those. Another issue discussed before was the floating characteristic of the awnings, and the board said they could do flat awnings or ones that were supported. Now there are glass elements over them, which is something that never would be seen in the historic district. She likes the transoms, but the size and breakup of the transoms is not right. She says the windows should be broken up with some panes. The windows appear overwhelming in consideration with what the glass sizes would have been in the Old Redmond period. She doesn't disagree with the trellises versus the porches, but the supports for those should have caps on the end to add detail to those elements. She's looking for more detail, like a cap, because there's no detail shown in the plans.

Mark Mullet responded on behalf of the applicant. Cables off the building suspend the curved canopy at the entryway. They didn't show up in the rendering very well. It's not intended that the canopy is cantilevered; it's suspended from the wall. The applicant added the glass, but if the glass needs to go, that's not a problem. There are panes broken up in the windows, smaller than they were a month ago, but again, these didn't show up in the rendering. Dianna asked if, on the corner element, glass met glass at that point. Mullet responded by saying the intention was that it not be corrugated, but be flat pieces of metal, much like the material that's on silos, historically. It would be more like it is in the rendering; less like it is in the line drawing. Mullet says glass would not meet glass in the corner; it's another rendering issue.

Staff is asking board for comment on the silo element, which is different from what the board had been mailed earlier. One version floats above the canopy, another comes down to meet the canopy. Mullet says related to that is the treatment of the column, meaning, does the silo and the expression of that form end there, or does it carry down. Mullet says he's responding to feedback from staff, which offered the recommendation to lift it off the canopy rather than leave it on.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- He likes the first rendering, but was concerned with the massing, in general. He liked the massing in the first iteration, but not what he's seeing tonight.
- He says the use of the colors and the articulation on three of the elevations gives it a little more interest. What he's seeing tonight seems a little more regulated. He doesn't see the building improving in this manner, and likes the old style better.
- Applicant asked if there was a concern about color. Lee responded color is an issue as well as design, but it's hard to pinpoint. He doesn't find the building as interesting as before, and all the sides look the same. Material and color changes could help.
- The upper windows need some changes; they just sit there at the cap.
- The windows have some issues. Lee understands the historical connections the applicant is trying to make. But he wonders if it would be possible to play with a few window combinations of a historical nature, because they all look the same to him. He'd like to see the windows not look like a checkerboard, but ones that would have historical content. He says that might help with the massing issue he has.
- The streetscape in general is pleasing to him. He agrees with the staff comments on the glass-paned archways. He doesn't have a preference to how the silo looks, but doesn't want to have the silo hanging out there. Staff may have recommended the floating look, but he would like to see it finished down, in a stylistic way.
- He's not happy with the top of the silo. To finish off the silo in a historical way would be great, but as it looks now, it doesn't feel like a silo anymore. He appreciates the idea of doing something with that corner and giving it a historical nature.
- Believes the small office building is perfectly fine. He enjoys the use of the wainscoting and the vertical elements from the original pictures. That brings more context to it.

- Has questions about the landscaping plan and possible changes. The applicant says not much has changed, other than adding some amenities.
- On the color, Lee's on the fence. He doesn't have an issue with the colors, just how they're applied and modulated to the building. He doesn't want it to look too regular. He'd prefer the blues of the original plan submitted.

Mr. Meade:

- He likes the wainscoting on the little building. He's not crazy about the building, but it's functional.
- He's much happier what he's seeing with this iteration of the plan in comparison to the former, even in light of the comments of the other board members. He likes the new design and new colors.
- The silo has taken a huge leap forward from where he saw it last time. He's not sure about what the top of it should look like. He doesn't think it should be floating at the bottom, but it doesn't merge into a rectilinear canopy very well either. Maybe that has to come together as one statement. Perhaps the canopy needs to be curvilinear.
- The column capital base sounds like a good idea. The radius entry cover doesn't work at all for Meade. He was looking for some logic in the old drawings provided, and saw something good on page 5, the tall, gabled silo with two openings at the top. He says borrowing from that shape might make more sense, creating a cupola-type shape for the mid-block entryway.
- Dianna says that might be easier to work with.
- Mr. Meade is still bothered by the vertical modulation. Staff pointed out before, and Mr. Meade agreed, that it looks lanky over the top windows. He suggested perhaps a band in that area, or perhaps bringing down the parapet a few feet. If there was some modulation that set it up like bookends, that might work too.
- He's impressed with what he's seeing this time compared to what he saw before. He's impressed with the rendering quality and the color. The details look great.
- Just to keep the silo idea coming down to the ground might involve a change with the paving as well to create a visual impact.
- The applicant suggested perhaps a change in the linear form, but asked if there could be changes in the paving. A conversation with Gary before indicated that might not be possible.
- Staff urged the applicant to talk again with Gary and push that idea.
- Staff says there may be an issue of right of way, or it may be on private property.
- The applicant says some of the silo extends into the right of way.
- Staff says Gary needs to have a conversation with Public Works and see if there's some leeway. It's worth exploring.
- David thinks it's a massive improvement, and likes how the applicant has pushed this forward.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- She's taking an opposite tack to Mr. Meade. The applicant says he's looking for one definitive answer, which draws several laughs.
- Liked what was sent to the board over the new plan, because the new plan gives the project a look like everything else on Cleveland Street, other projects which the board approved.
- She liked the expression of bricks coming up in the middle.
- She also likes the bottom of all the pieces.
- The applicant asks if this is a question of color, and adds that the only thing that has changed is the color.
- Sally points out the windows have changed and the transoms.
- The applicant says the rendering might look different, but there will still be a break-up in the windows.
- She doesn't like how the black railings turned into contemporary railings.
- The applicant points out the railings were always galvanized; just the line weight has changed.
- The new plan has colors the board has approved for everything else.
- She's starting to wonder if the literal expression of the silo is the best thing for that corner. She seems to think there's a struggle going on. It appears the applicant is trying to stick this element in on that corner, but a rectilinear galvanized piece might make more sense. The pieces that have been left are all the rectilinear galvanized buildings.
- The applicant points out nothing is left of T & D Feed.
- Staff points out the rectilinear forms repeat themselves in the whole mill.

- Sally says if the applicant asked people who have lived in the area for a while if they remember round silos, they would not remember.
- Staff says the silos were added later; applicant says they were there when it was demolished in 2001.
- Sally doesn't remember them being there.
- Staff points out that the silos were on the backside, and people rarely saw them.
- Applicant says as a longtime resident of Redmond, when he looked over, he saw the silos off of Leary. Design review in 2001 added the silo. The applicant has spent the last five years cleaning up environmental contamination, but points out the silo was added by design review. Gary Lee was the planner at the time as well.
- Sally says the silo looks too skinny and too tall. It hits the canopy in a goofy way, because silos don't fly in the air.
- The idea of the silo doesn't have to be a literal, round thing. She says that corner begs for some hearkening back to the past, but doesn't know how to resolve that idea. She doesn't think the silo resolves it. She wants to pull it down to the ground, which would make it look like a pencil. The applicant points out it can't be pulled down to the ground, because that would be in the right of way.
- Board asks about the space in front of the silo, on the interior. Applicant says it's a living room.
- The applicant says the silo could go five feet over the right of way if you're 13 feet off the ground.
- Sally says the direction is good, but sees that the board is leaving some mixed messages.
- The applicant says as long as the project keeps moving, and has some alternate options, that he's okay with that. He would like to move through the technical review process, and will be back with more drawings later.

Staff is asking the board for more clarity, and asked David about any other thoughts on the color. David says the color will evolve over time. He's not reacting to the color now. He says the project does look like other projects on Cleveland, so some push and pull on the modulations could help make it more distinct. He says the silo is not fully resolved; finding some way to ground it would be a good idea. Perhaps some vertical color striations could help make it stand out. He says it's preliminary, but he doesn't mind the direction it's going. He likes it, and says it comes across as fun. David says the building has a playfulness, and headed in a direction that could eventually be something the board could appreciate too. He had a question about the color on the balconies when it comes to the galvanized material, and is asking the applicant to be flexible. He'd like to see a historical precedence, but perhaps not so literal.

Dianna asks about the brick coming up, and the applicant points out it goes up two or three floors. David asks if there's a head-on elevation rendering; he'd like to see that. Lee agrees with David that the massing and articulation, when they come together, have some issues. Lee would like to see some different options of what works and what the vision is. He says color and articulation are not formed yet. He's in favor of the project in general, but points out it is a special spot and shouldn't be like other properties along Cleveland Street. It should be its own special building, but retain a character of the downtown. Lee says resolving the silo, playing with the articulation, resolving the color, and figuring out the details of the modulation, once they're put together, will be solid and able to stand on its own. Lee wants the applicant to know he supports the project, but wants it to be bigger, better and greater. David thanks them for submitting new work.

Steve recaps that Lee liked the massing in what was originally mailed out to the board more than what he saw in the packet released tonight. The concerns are the project is too regular. David points out the massing are identical, and the color plays into that. There's a perception of massing due to that color. David says there's a deviation between the two plans, indicating a color break and synergy towers, showing the color going up a few stories. The applicant says it's an issue of color application. Staff says the board has said consistently something needs to change above the top layer of windows, from playing with the parapet heights to adding something else up there. Applicant says what differentiates the color schemes is a greater contrast with the blue versus the other colors.

Sally says under the articulation, the colors punched out, and one could see the jewelry on the building. That's lost in the current plan. The applicant asks if the palette of colors is appropriate. Sally says color may be premature at this point. Staff says color will be a big deal, because it's having a huge impact on

the appearance of massing, and should be handled sooner rather than later. Applicant agrees it's a critical issue. Sally says this looks very similar to what exists on Cleveland East. Staff says that other project took a lot of work to get to where it was. Staff tells applicant not to be afraid to be original or distinctive from what else is happening. Staff doesn't want this project to look like every other building in that area.

Height limit will be capped the same for the buildings in that area, and staff says rectangular bays are common. Staff is of the opinion that the cylindrical silo element is unresolved. But it's a shape and form that's unlike anything else in the area. The applicant asks if the silo should be done at all. Staff says if it doesn't work, the applicant shouldn't beat himself up to make it work, or force it to work. Staff adds the thought, though, that the silo form would be distinctive. The idea would be to find the magic to make it work and set the building apart. It could be iconic to the downtown and set the building apart. Staff adds that the only other distinctive shape on the site would be the cupola.

Applicant would like to add some more variety in the windows, and could envision a series of windows, much like a sunroom, in the silo area. There's a concern that could make it too modern. David adds there are bands of windows in the historic pictures of the silos. Braces might help knit that corner, the applicant says. The applicant says the form could almost look like an umbrella with the silo. Staff suggests rounding some corners on the braces. It wouldn't be historic, but the rounded shape could help ground it. Rounding the awning and then bringing spokes down might be an idea, or bring spokes in off the column on a diagonal. The applicant says the halo idea isn't good, so he says that might be a good idea. David says the silo cap is what it is, and should be left as a shallow, conical cap. Staff says even a lighted cone could work. David adds that having something dull, not bright at the top would make sense. Dianna says some banding could be added. The applicant asks if the cone should be solid or just something with splines going up. The applicant says having the silo rise above the building, and be lit, might look good. He'd rather put the waterproofing inside the silo.

David says the project can come into proportion. The applicant is asking for guidance on the color. David says what's been provided looks very safe. Projects down the streets have some exciting colors. David is asking for the applicant to think about their clientele and their buyers, and provide vibrant colors to attract them. He's thinking maybe a deep red could be an answer. The applicant says a color consultant suggested a deep mahogany color, to give more contrast. There are other alternatives, including some that are much redder. David says a lot of businesses in Redmond are using yellow and brown, but they'll be back in a few years to paint with a new color. He'd like to see the applicant paint with a color that wouldn't have to be changed, but one that would fit the clientele for a long time. Staff says the paint is a Victorian palette, but some of them can have some high contrast that is attractive. Board hasn't stuck with a certain color for the downtown area. Applicant sees no one wants to commit to a palette, but the board does want to see some contrast in the colors to give it a bang.

Sally says the composition and contrast is key, not just the blue color. Applicant hears a more contrasting color could help break up the façade. David says the color can be a tool, like a rifle shot or a shotgun shot. Right now, it's a shotgun shot, trying to hit everybody. The board is asking the applicant to focus in on their market. The applicant says with 130 units, the market is broad. So, the reality is, selling these, you want to make them as easy as possible to buy. Staff points out the meeting tape is almost done. Sally asks if custom window colors might help with some changes. Applicant says that's possible. Sally points out the white vinyl is everywhere in Redmond.

Staff is asking the board for guidance on color to the applicant. There's a split between contemporary and something that's out of the box. Yet, the board is being very conservative with the color combination. The board is saying, don't be so conservative, be more daring with the color, contrast, and color combinations. That will break up the massing, make it more distinctive, and help tie into the massing that's going on, with the shapes. The applicant says the designer had three different choices, and he went with the one that has less contrast. The applicant has no problem using richer colors with more contrast, but he'd just done a project similar to this.

Applicant is asking what's next on the easement process. The applicant says he's five weeks out from having a coordination meeting on that. Staff says what's happened here tonight will not be a problem. Another pre-application with a following approval could happen. The design review board will not be the driving force; the technical committee review will be, in terms of timing. The coordination meeting, then the

pre-submittal meeting will happen after that. Staff confirms the applicant is moving forward with the technical committee side of things. The applicant will meet again with staff to sort things out.

**IT WAS MOVED BY LEE MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 11:37 P.M. DAVID MEADE
SECONDS THE MOTION. MOTION APPROVED (3-0).**

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY